DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 078 793 HE 004 419

TITLE	Professional Leave Report, 1971-1972.
INSTITUTION	Washington State Council on Higher Education, Olympia, Washington.
PUB DATE	72
NOTE	25p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	Attendance; Budgets; *College Teachers; *Educational Finance; *Higher Education; *Leave of Absence; Personnel Policy; *Sabbatical Leaves
IDENTIFIERS	*Washington

ABSTRACT

This document reviews professional leave data, 1971-72 in Washington. Following background material, guidelines for percentage range and financial aspects based on statistical data are presented. The Washington Council on Higher Education response to the request for the legislative budget committee concerning sabbatical and stipend leave programs administered by educational institutions and state agencies is included. (MJM)

ED 078793

Council on Higher Education
State of Washington

PROFESSIONAL LEAVE REPORT

1971-1972

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

HE 004 419

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Professional Leave Report, 1971-72

Background

During the 42nd Legislature, First Extraordinary Session, the Legislature inserted a special proviso on professional leave programs in the budget bill, Engrossed Substitute House Bill 151, which imposes the following restrictions or prohibitions:

> Provided that no monies appropriated to agencies or departments of the state may be used or spent for any sabbatical leaves for any employees of this state or any subdivisions receiving state appropriations, except that sabbatical leaves including replacement costs and the percentage of salary awarded the recipient shall not exceed the annual contracted salary of said recipients while in residence at any one institution or agency... (Vetoed section)... and further, all institutions of higher education shall be subject to sabbatical leave guidelines as adopted by the Council on Higher Education and as reviewed by the Legislative Budget Committee.

In essence the proviso requires that no institution shall expend additional monies above and beyond the annual contracted salary for those professional leave recipients and the necessary replacements for those persons while on professional leave. It was felt that in the time of economic crisis the curtailment of professional leave programs would in some manner save money for both the institutions and the State.

The professional leave guidelines as established by the Council on Higher Education were determined through several committee sessions with the four-

year institutions of higher education. The original request for guidelines came from the Legislative Budget Committee in its report Sabbatical and Stipend Leave Programs Administered by Educational Institutions and State Agencies, December, 1970. The recommendations indicate that "the State Board of Education and the Council on Higher Education, in conjunction with the State Board for Community College Education, should evaluate this report and respond as to whether or not it is possible to form uniform, comprehensive, and equitable policies" for all institutions of higher education in the State. Immediately following that report the Council staff entered into discussions with the state four-year institutions and the State Board for Community College Education to determine whether or not it would be possible to implement guidelines in all institutions. It was decided at the outset that the state four-year institutions would be agreeable to adopting a set of guidelines which would be equitable and uniform. The State Board for Community College Education in its deliberations, also came to the same conclusion and proposed guidelines similar to those developed by the Council on Higher Education with several exceptions.

After the legislature approved the statutory provisions on professional leave which required the adoption of guidelines covering all public institutions of higher education, the State Board for Community College Education transmitted recommendations for community college professional leave guidelines to the Council on Higher Education for its consideration. The Council, after discussion and review, determined that the exceptions as stated by the

community college system were not in keeping with the Council on Higher Education guidelines which had been cited by the Legislature in the proviso. After some clarification as to the purpose of the professional leave, which is "to improve the professional skills of the faculty members through study, research, and creative work," the Council on Higher Education took the position that the professional leave guidelines as passed by the Council on April 1, 1971, should apply to community colleges as well as to the public four-year institutions.

Guidelines: Percentage Range

A primary concern in the establishment of guidelines was to establish criteria whereby the number of faculty receiving professional leave could be monitored. The guidelines specify a percentage range of 2.5 to 3.5 percent at each institution as an acceptable level for the number of faculty to receive leave in any academic year. Since professional leave is granted for a period of one term to a full academic year, it was decided that the leave should be determined on a basis which would give an accurate accounting of the amount of time that the individual is away from the campus. Accordingly, a full time equivalent professional leave index was used as a definitional base for determining the actual number of faculty persons participating in the program. A definition of full time equivalent professional leave is the total number of quarters that faculty members are on leave divided by three (3), or in the case of the semester, divided by two (2); e.g., if ten persons are each granted one quarter leave, the FTE professional leave is 3.3.

In reviewing the data for the 1971-72 academic year, 134 persons are on FTE professional leave; 150 persons were on professional leave in the previous year. The community colleges had 48 persons on professional leave in 1970;

this year the number has decreased to 34. A decrease of 15 percent has been experienced by all public institutions of higher education between the last two years. The reasons for this decrease generally stem from the stringent budget situation. Another reason, of course, is the requirement in the statutory proviso that the cost of the professional leave shall not exceed that of the salary to be paid the person while on leave plus the cost of a replacement.

Table I shows a five-year comparison of the number and percentage of professional leaves for the four-year public institutions. It is evident from these figures that there has been a decrease in the number of professional leaves granted during the past few years. Table II is a two-year comparison for the community colleges. Of the 22 community college districts, only 15 offer professional leave programs. Of the 15 districts which offer the program, only 9 awarded professional leaves this past year. The smaller colleges undoubtedly are at a disadvantage in granting professional leaves because of their inability to reallocate personnel in order to take over a particular course for a person who is on professional leave.

Tables III and IV show the percentage range in 1971-72 for the number of persons on professional leave as compared to the number of FTE faculty. The professional leave guidelines stipulate a range of 2.5 to 3.5 percent at each institution for the number of persons on leave as compared to full time equivalent faculty. "Any institution exceeding this range shall adjust its policies accordingly." There were no institutions that exceeded the 3.5 percent maximum as required in the guidelines. Therefore, all institu-

TABLE I

Five Year Comparison
Percentage of Professional Leaves Based on F.T.E. Budgeted Faculty (06-1, 06-2)
Four-Year Colleges and Universities

	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971
University of Washington					
F.T.E. Faculty *	2,083.	2,201.	2,337.	2,379.	2,290
Professional Leaves - F.T.E.**	67.	72.	81.	75.	61.
Percent	3.22%	3.27%	3.47%	3.15%	2.668
Washington State University					
F.T.E. Faculty	631.252	677.470	697.924	749.807	736.28
Professional Leaves - F.T.E.	18.50	29.00	21.00	21.00	17.315
Percent	2.93%	4.28%	3.01%	2.80%	2.35%
Western Washington State College					
F.T.E. Faculty	355.3	386.0	430.8	520.8	510.5
Professional Leaves - F.T.E.	5.50	5.33	7.33	8.0	7.0
Percent	1.55%	1.38%	1.70%	1.54%	1.37%
Central Washington State College					
F.T.E. Faculty	284.0	323.0	353.0	395.0	391.28
Professional Leaves - F.T.E.	3.33	6.66	6.0	5.66	4.67
Percent	1.33%	2.06%	1.70%	1.43%	1.19%
Eastern Washington State College					
F.T.E. Faculty	242.28	277.22	311.89	397.0	371.56
Professional Leaves - F.T.E.	2.0	7.67	7.33	12.0	9.67
Percent	.83%	2.77%	2.35%	3.02%	2.60%
The Evergreen State College					
F.T.E. Faculty	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	57.0
Professional Leaves - F.T.E.					0.0
Percent					0.0%

*The full time equivalent faculty members are derived from the instruction and departmental research budgetary program.

**A full time equivalent professional leave is the total number of quarters faculty members are on leave divided by 3, or in the case of semesters, divided by 2; e.g. if 10 persons are granted one quarter leaves the F.T.E. professional leave is 3.3.

CHE 11/24/71

TABLE II

Two Year Comparison
Percentage of Professional Leaves Based on FTE Professional Personnel
Washington Community College System

Dist.		1970-71	1971-72
1	Peninsula		
	FTE Professional Personnel	47.63	41.72
	FTE Leaves	1.00	-
	Percent	2.10	-
2	Grays Harbor		
	FTE Professional Personnel	68.92	93.97
	FTE Leaves	1.00	-
	Percent	1.45	-
3	Olympic		
	FTE Professional Personnel	141.01	112.17
	FTE Leaves	2.33	2.00
	Percent	1.65	1.78
4	Skagit Valley		
	FTE Professional Personnel	117.30	106.09
	FTE Leaves	2.00	-
	Percent	1.71	-
5	Everett-Edmonds		
	FTE Professional Personnel	235.61	233.86
	FTE Leaves	5.33	4.00
	Percent	2.26	1.71
6	Seattle		
	FTE Professional Personnel	441.92	448.37
	FTE Leaves	5.22	3.33
	Percent	1.18	.74
7	Shoreline		
	FTE Professional Personnel	156.07	168.86
	FTE Leaves	4.67	3.66
	Percent	2.99	2.17
8	Bellevue		
	FTE Professional Personnel	156.56	150.74
	FTE Leaves	1.33	2.00
	Percent	.85	1.33
9	Highline		
	FTE Professional Personnel	175.26	191.49
	FTE Leaves	2.67	1.33
	Percent	1.52	.69
10	Green River		
	FTE Professional Personnel	159.78	164.88
	FTE Leaves	3.78	5.33
	Percent	2.37	3.23

Dist.		1970-71	1971-72
11	Fort Steilacoom		
	FTE Professional Personnel	70.41	65.50
	FTE Leaves	-	-
	Percent	-	-
12	Centralia		
	FTE Professional Personnel	87.28	121.26*
	FTE Leaves	-	-
	Percent	-	-
13	Lower Columbia		
	FTE Professional Personnel	79.71	72.47
	FTE Leaves	-	-
	Percent	-	-
14	Clark		
	FTE Professional Personnel	148.28	143.59
	FTE Leaves	1.33	-
	Percent	.90	-
15	Wenatchee Valley		
	FTE Professional Personnel	70.21	63.32
	FTE Leaves	3.00	-
	Percent	4.27	-
16	Yakima Valley		
	FTE Professional Personnel	137.82	114.36
	FTE Leaves	1.00	2.33
	Percent	.73	2.04
17	Spokane		
	FTE Professional Personnel	282.82	288.04
	FTE Leaves	-	-
	Percent	-	-
18	Big Bend		
	FTE Professional Personnel	59.76	52.51
	FTE Leaves	2.00	-
	Percent	3.35	-
19	Columbia Basin		
	FTE Professional Personnel	136.45	136.32
	FTE Leaves	-	-
	Percent	-	-
20	Walla Walla		
	FTE Professional Personnel	68.21	71.41
	FTE Leaves	-	-
	Percent	-	-
21	Whatcom		
	FTE Professional Personnel	5.53	11.65
	FTE Leaves	-	-
	Percent	-	-

* Includes OVTI (35.88)

Dist.		1970-71	1971-72
22	Tacoma		
	FTE Professional Personnel	132.25	138.00
	FTE Leaves	3.33	2.00
	Percent	2.52	1.45
	SYSTEM TOTALS		
	FTE Professional Personnel	2,978.79	2,965.99
	FTE Leaves	40.00	26.00
	Percent	1.34	.88
	Institutions Offering Professional Leave		
	FTE Professional Personnel	2,248.38	1,662.73
	FTE Leaves	40.00	26.00
	Percent	1.78	1.56

TABLE III

1971-72 PROFESSIONAL LEAVE SUMMARY

Institution	No. of FTE Faculty	No. of Faculty on Prof. Leave Headcount	Total No. of Quarters	Prof. Leave F T E	Percent On Leave
University of Washington	2,290.00	78	183.00	61.00	2.66
Washington State University	736.28	29	34.63*	17.32	2.35
Western Washington State College	510.50	10	21.00	7.00	1.37
Central Washington State College	391.28	5	14.00	4.67	1.15
Eastern Washington State College	371.56	12	29.00	9.67	2.57
The Evergreen State College	57.00	-	-	-	-

* semesters

CHE 12/10/71

TABLE IV

1971-72 PROFESSIONAL LEAVE SUMMARY
WASHINGTON COMMUNITY COLLEGE SYSTEM

DIST.	COLLEGE	NO. OF FTE FACULTY	HEADCOUNT NO. OF FACULTY ON PROF. LEAVE	TOTAL NO. OF QUARTERS	PROFESSIONAL LEAVE - FTE	PERCENT ON LEAVE
1	Peninsula	41.72	0	0	0	0
2	Grays Harbor	93.97	0	0	0	0
3	Olympic	112.17	2	6	2	1.78
4	Skagit Valley	106.09	0	0	0	0
5	Everett-Edmonds	233.86	4	12	4	1.71
6	Seattle	448.37	6	10	3.33	.74
7	Shoreline	168.86	4	11	3.66	2.17
8	Bellevue	150.74	2	6	2	1.33
9	Highline	191.49	4	4	1.33	.69
10	Green River	164.88	6	16	5.33	3.23
11	Fort Steilacoom	65.50	0	0	0	0
12	Centralia	121.26*	0	0	0	0
13	Lower Columbia	72.47	0	0	0	0
14	Clark	143.59	0	0	0	0
15	Wenatchee Valley	63.32	0	0	0	0
16	Yakima Valley	114.36	3	7	2.33	2.04
17	Spokane	288.04	0	0	0	0
18	Big Bend	52.51	0	0	0	0
19	Columbia Basin	136.32	0	0	0	0
20	Walla Walla	71.41	0	0	0	0
21	Whatcom	11.65	0	0	0	0
22	Tacoma	138.00	3	6	2	1.45
	SYSTEM TOTALS	2,965.99	34	78	26	.88
	Institutions Offering Professional Leave	1,662.73	34	78	26	1.56

*Includes OVTI (35.88)

CHE 12/10/71

tions have complied with the percentage range provision of the Council on Higher Education guidelines.

Guidelines: Financial Aspects

An important factor concerned with both the guidelines and the proviso contained in the budget document relates to the cost of the professional leave program. As stated earlier, expenditures for the program are not to exceed the amount of the contracted salary for the period of the leave for the recipient. This requirement was difficult for some institutions to meet in the first year of the guidelines operation. There are several reasons which account for this problem. Many of the institutions had already granted permission to persons to prepare for a professional leave prior to the time the restriction became effective. Other difficulties appeared as the institution formulated general professional leave policies and attempted to work through the financial arrangements made within each of the departments for persons on professional leave. In other words, if a leave is granted in the history department, the exact amount to be paid from institutional funds to the recipient may not be definitely fixed. The faculty member may be waiting for grants or other stipends to provide assistance while on leave. These additional monies reduce the cost of the professional leave to the institution.

Another complicating factor concerns the hiring of replacement personnel. It is often difficult to replace personnel with the exact amount remaining in the recipient's contracted salary for the period of the leave. The institution is required to do a great deal of juggling in order to come out at zero additional

cost for the professional leave program. The only certain way to assure that the institution would not incur additional costs is for all the duties to be absorbed by colleagues while the recipient is away from the institution. This is not an easy matter to accomplish in small institutions or departments.

In spite of the problems described, the institutions spent less in total for the professional leave program during 1971-72 than the amount paid to the recipients plus the cost of replacements. Tables V and VI summarize the 1971-72 cost for those institutions which participated in the program. Primarily because of the University of Washington, the four-year institutions paid less to professional leave recipients and their replacements than the contracted salaries for the period of the leave. The net difference was $225,888. Two of the four-year institutions exceeded the zero cost limit, but by a very small margin as compared to previous years.

The community colleges had an actual cost to the entire system which was $24,165 less than the total salaries the leave recipients would have received had no leave been granted. The net cost difference for all public institutions was approximately $250,000 less than the combined salaries of replacements and professional leave recipients. This represents a substantial difference from the 1970-71 academic year when the net cost difference totalled approximately $10,000 above the salaries of recipients and replacements for the period of the leave.

Summary

In summary, all institutions of higher education have made serious efforts to stay within the recent guidelines and statutory provisions set forth on

TABLE V

AGGREGATE COSTS
PROFESSIONAL LEAVES, 1971-72
FOUR-YEAR PUBLIC INSTITUTIONS

INSTITUTION	CONTRACTED SALARY FOR PERIOD OF LEAVE	SALARY TO BE PAID WHILE ON LEAVE	FACULTY REPLACEMENT COSTS	NET COST DIFFERENCE
University of Washington	1,038,623	663,360	146,756	(228,507)
Washington State University	473,426	420,728	50,888	(1,810)
Western Washington State College	106,577	79,934	30,015	+3,372
Central Washington State College	55,871	41,279	14,592	-0-
Eastern Washington State College	135,983	96,740	40,300	+1,057
The Evergreen State College	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-
TOTAL	$ 1,810,480	$ 1,302,041	$ 282,551	$(225,888)

CHE 12/15/71

TABLE VI

AGGREGATE COSTS
PROFESSIONAL LEAVES, 1971-72
COMMUNITY COLLEGES

DIST.	COLLEGE	CONTRACTED SALARY FOR PERIOD OF LEAVE	SALARY TO BE PAID WHILE ON LEAVE	FACULTY REPLACEMENT COSTS	NET COST DIFFERENCE
3	Olympic	24,722	18,542	3,780	(2,400)
5	Everett	54,541	22,000	26,060	(6,481)
6	Seattle	40,983	20,492	18,166	(2,325)
7	Shoreline	48,532	34,942	13,590	-0-
8	Bellevue	28,044	16,610	11,200	(234)
9	Highline	16,988	11,503	5,485	-0-
10	Green River	84,136	47,098	37,038	-0-
16	Yakima	30,480	15,240	-0-	(15,240)
22	Tacoma	24,858	16,573	10,800	+2,515
	TOTAL	$ 353,284	$ 203,000	$ 126,119	$(24,165)

CHE 12/15/71

professional leave. In those instances when the cost of the professional leave exceeded the salary paid to the recipient plus replacement costs, the problems associated with attempting to grant professional leaves at zero cost have been recognized. The second year of the biennium should provide the institutions with ample time to prepare for, and control, the zero cost provision.

The Council on Higher Education will continue to monitor the professional leave program through a case study approach of individual programs as requested by the Legislative Budget Committee. The purpose of this study will be to determine more clearly the value of the professional leave program to the institution, the faculty member, and the State. An outline of the proposed professional leave study is attached. A more rigorous look at the types of leaves, the number of persons affected, and the actual benefits of leaves will be undertaken through this study and an analysis will be presented to the 1973 legislative session with recommendations and policy considerations.

COUNCIL ON HIGHER EDUCATION

A Response to the Request From the
Legislative Budget Committee
Concerning
Sabbatical and Stipend Leave Programs
Administered by Educational Institutions and State Agencies

Background:

The Council on Higher Education was requested to respond to recommendations included in the report produced by the Legislative Budget Committee, entitled, Sabbatical and Stipend Leave Programs Administered by Educational Institutions and State Agencies, December, 1970. The recommendations indicate that the State Board of Education and the Council on Higher Education, in conjunction with the State Board for Community College Education, should evaluate this report and respond to whether or not it is possible to form "uniform, comprehensive, and equitable policies" for all institutions of higher education in the State.

The Council staff entered into discussions with the state four-year institutions and the State Board for Community College Education to determine whether or not it would be possible to implement uniform guidelines for all institutions. A series of meetings with representatives from each of the state four-year colleges and universities was held by the Council staff. It was decided at the outset that the institutions would be agreeable to adopting a set of guidelines which would be equitable and uniform for all the public four-year colleges and universities. The State Board for Community College Education also held meetings and came to a similar determination.

Guidelines for professional leave were produced and agreed upon by representatives of the various institutions. The State Board for Community College Education reviewed the guidelines as established and is in the process of determining policies for implementation in the community college system.

Purpose of Professional Leave:

Since initiation of the program the concept of sabbatical leave has evolved from one of a reward for a specific length of service to the institution to an opportunity which would provide an experience for the continued development of teachers and scholars. This dichotomy of a reward system versus the enrichment of faculty resources through a professional leave has been discussed by Dr. Solomon Katz, Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost, of the University of Washington, in a paper entitled, "Purpose and Practice of a Professional Leave Program:"

"Professional leave granted under certain circumstances to faculty members by colleges and universities have a long history. The purpose and practice of a professional leave program, however, are not always clearly understood outside the circles of higher education....

"Some confusion derives from the common use of the term 'sabbatical leave,' which incorrectly implies that leave is automatically granted to every member of the faculty each seventh year, and that the period is intended as a time of sabbath-like resting from labors. A more accurate term is 'professional leave,' which more precisely indicates that it is a leave granted and at least partially supported by the university for the benefits expected to accrue to the institution and its functions."[1]

The Association of American Colleges has developed a similar statement of primary purposes for a professional leave. The primary purposes for professional leaves are:

1. "The professional development of the teacher and thereby the increased effectiveness of higher education."

2. "The direct usefulness of the work expected to be done while on leave."[2]

The Professional Leave Guidelines, as developed by the Council on Higher Education, are in agreement with this philosophy. The Council guidelines state that the primary purpose of a professional leave "shall be to improve the professional skills of the faculty member through study, research and creative work." The philosophy is further supported by the criteria for selection of projects or plans submitted by faculty members. The criteria for selection of project or plan should be evaluated according to "the value of a project or plan in relationship to teaching responsibilities."

Report Recommendations:

In responding to the specific recommendations as provided in the Legislative Budget Committee report, the Council on Higher Education has adopted the majority of the suggestions as presented. A period of six years is necessary to qualify for consideration for a professional leave; no leave shall be granted for the primary purpose of traveling; ordinarily professional leave shall not be granted to individuals who have less than three years of service to the institution prior to retirement; and the length of leave shall not exceed one full year for any particular person. Further, the guidelines designate a selection process which should take place in the institution and criteria from which plans should be evaluated. Information to be included in all applications for professional leave is specified and submission of a written report upon returning from the professional leave is required.

---

[1] Solomon Katz, "Professional Leave; Purpose and Practice of a Professional Leave Program," University of Washington, February, 1971.

[2] Association of American Colleges, "A Statement on Leaves of Absence," AAUP Bulletin, Autumn, 1967.

The only recommendation in this area which has not been adopted is a suggestion by the LBC report which would require two years of obligatory service upon return to the institution. In a brief survey run by each of the four-year institutions, it was determined that it was a very exceptional situation when a faculty person did not stay at the institution for the now-specified period of one year following the leave, and that the number during the second year was also equally low. However, since the LBC report contains an expressed concern, the Council will continue to monitor the return-service factor for faculty members after professional leave.

Financing of the professional leave program in the institution is dependent upon the internal mix of faculty members and responsibilities to be carried out during a particular academic year. Therefore, the method for providing funds has been left entirely to the institution. However, the Council guidelines specifically request the institutions to work toward a "break-even" costing in administering the professional leave program. This would mean replacements for faculty on professional leave should be provided for within the institution itself, thereby avoiding the hiring of additional faculty members. Also, the guidelines encourage individual faculty members to apply for outside grants for their professional leave. In no event shall the sum of the professional leave salary and additional funds in the form of grants and stipends exceed the amount of the normally contracted salary for the period of the leave.

In order to continue to evaluate the cost of the professional leave program within each institution, the institutions are requested to make both a preliminary report and a final report to the Council providing information which would allow the Council to analyze the costs of the program on both the gross cost and net cost approach. It was definitely felt by each of the institutions that while both figures provided a valid analysis, that the net cost approach was the most appropriate method for accurately portraying the cost to the State for such a program.

The greatest concern in establishing these guidelines was to set up some type of criteria whereby the number of faculty receiving professional leave could be monitored. In working with various figures, it was determined that the vast majority of persons on professional leave come from the Instruction and Departmental Research Program, as specified in the budget. Accordingly, the total F.T.E. faculty in this program was used as a point of comparability among institutions. Further, it was determined that professional leaves should be tabulated according to the amount of time that a faculty member would be away from the institution as compared to total numbers of persons absent for professional leave. Therefore, it was decided that a full time equivalent professional leave should be used as the definitional base for determining the actual amount of faculty persons participating in the program. A definition of full time equivalent professional leave is the total number of quarters faculty members are on leave divided by three, or in the case of semesters, divided by two; e.g., if ten persons are granted one quarter leave, the F.T.E. professional leave is 3.3.

A range of 2.5 - 3.5 percent has been established to provide general parameters for the number of professional leaves granted in any particular year. In a questionnaire to the institutions in the seven comparison states, it was determined that very few had specified a maximum percentage of persons who could be on professional leave at any one time. The average nationally of faculty on professional leave for 1962-63, as reported by Mark H. Ingraham in The Outer Fringe,[1] is approximately 3.4 percent. The method for analysis utilized is not specifically comparable to the Council on Higher Education guidelines, however. If the statistical base had been the same for both studies, the national figures would be somewhat higher. Therefore the 2.5 - 3.5 percent would seem to be a minimal and reasonable percentage range in the light of criteria used elsewhere.

The guidelines also allow for special circumstances which might arise at any individual institution and for a procedure to review the guidelines annually.

Recommendations Regarding Educational Merit Study:

The Council on Higher Education has not addressed itself to any of the questions regarding educational merit of the professional leave program at this time. The second recommendation to the Council by the Legislative Budget Committee report indicates that an in-depth study should be undertaken to determine the value of a professional leave program. This is a very important consideration and one which the Council has begun to explore in initial conversations with the representatives of the various institutions. It is anticipated that within the next few months the Council staff will be meeting with representatives of faculty groups to design a research project which will encompass these additional concerns expressed in the legislative report.

The guidelines which have been established to date will provide the basic statistical information needed to evaluate the professional leave program. Until further research is completed it will be difficult to make additional policy recommendations to improve the professional leave program. Only after an evaluation which explores every aspect of professional leave including quality, educational merit, cost factors, value to the institution, students and faculty, can meaningful recommendations be made.

---

[1] Mark H. Ingraham, with the collaboration of Francis P. King, The Outer Fringe, The University of Wisconsin Press, Madison and Milwaukee, 1965.

Professional Leave Guidelines

1. The purpose of a professional leave shall be to improve the professional skills of the faculty member through study, research, and creative work. The institution will receive direct benefit of such an experience through the increased effectiveness of those persons participating in a professional leave program.

2. Selection for professional leave shall be based upon the worthiness of the project or plan as submitted by the faculty member. It is intended that each institution conduct a rigorous and thorough selection procedure in the awarding of professional leave.

3. Projects or plans should be evaluated according to their value to the institution based on the following criteria:

   a. Value of project or plan in relationship to teaching responsibilities.

   b. Ability of applicant to achieve goals of project or plan as based on past experience and academic background.

   c. Need for new or additional knowledge in subject field to be studied.

   d. Quality of replacement personnel designated to take the responsibilities of the applicant.

   e. Evidence of support (in the form of recommendations and/or financial) from other institutions, foundations, or persons concerned with the proposed plan or project.

4. A minimum of six years of service to the institution is required before qualifying for consideration for professional leave.

5. A period of one year's service following a professional leave will be required upon return from leave.

6. Ordinarily professional leave will not be granted to individuals who, upon return from professional leave, will have less than three years of service to the institution prior to retirement.

7. Applications for professional leave at all institutions should include the following information:

   a. General information including name, department, rank, date of initial service with the college or university, terms of leave desired, dates of previous professional leaves, and percent of salary to be awarded as based on other grants and funding.

   b. A detailed statement of the applicant's plans for utilizing the time requested. This statement should include such information as the time sequence for completion of any project or plan.

   c. A list of foundations, institutions, or other organizations with which the applicant will be affiliated during the professional leave.

d. A complete listing of grants and stipends other than those granted by the institution which will be available to the applicant during the time of professional leave.

e. If there is any travel to be included in the professional leave, the need must be justified in terms of the proposed project or plan for study.

f. Background information concerning the applicant's previous professional or scholarly work, especially in the area of the proposed plan.

g. A copy of the applicant's bibliography of publications should be attached to the application.

h. Supporting letters from faculty members or other appropriate individuals not necessarily associated with the institution may also be submitted if the applicant so desires.

i. A statement regarding the value of the applicant's project in terms of benefit to the institution upon return from professional leave.

8. Upon return to the institution each person shall submit a written report summarizing the work completed during professional leave and how the new knowledge shall be utilized by the person in teaching assignments and additional research.

9. It is not intended that applicants on a professional leave would engage in other employment. If employment were a part of the project or plan it would necessarily have to be justified within the terms of the purpose of the professional leave.

10. Professional leave will not be granted for the purpose of working for an advanced degree.

11. Recognizing the diversity of methods for providing funds for professional leave, the individual institution should be responsible for allocating the resources necessary for a professional leave. However, it is strongly urged that the institutions establish the professional leave program on a "break-even" basis. In other words, replacements for persons on professional leave should ordinarily take place within existing faculty to the extent that it is possible.

12. The sum of the professional leave salary and additional funds in the form of grants and stipends shall not exceed the amount of the normally contracted salary for the period of the leave.

13. The awarding of professional leave involves not only the selection of a worthy project, but is dependent upon internal academic decisions involving class scheduling, replacement personnel, and budgetary constraints. Therefore, the number of professional leaves may vary from year to year. It is the purpose of these guidelines to allow flexibility in the percent of professional leaves awarded by any one particular institution. However, in order to provide some uniformity and comparability among institutions, each college and university shall submit the number of persons receiving

professional leave, the length of the leave, and the number of budgeted F.T.E. faculty members. A percentage figure for each institution shall be generated annually.

It is the intent of these guidelines to set a range of 2.5 - 3.5 percent for the percentage of full time equivalent professional leavesgranted. Any institution exceeding this range shall adjust its policies accordingly.

The base figure used to provide some comparability among institutions is the budgeted full time equivalent faculty included in the Instruction and Departmental Research Program. It should be pointed out that those institutions which have a policy allowing librarians and administrators who have faculty rank to participate in a professional leave program will have a consistently higher percentage figure. For example, Washington State University has a total of 1,363.177 F.T.E. faculty from which persons could conceivably receive a professional leave. However, the number of persons in the instruction and departmental research portion of the budget totals 749.807--a difference of 613.37 F.T.E. personnel. Therefore, WSU's figures would appear to be higher than other institutions. (1970-71.)

14. Institutions should institute programs which would encourage the applicant to apply for and, hopefully, receive outside funds for professional leave programs. Such a program has been outlined by the University of Washington and could be used as an example. This procedure would also assist in the goal of placing a professional leave program on a no-cost basis, without deteriorating the quality of instruction.

15. Each institution shall submit a preliminary report to the Council on Higher Education in April of each year, and a final report by July 1, stipulating:

    a. The number of persons to receive professional leave,

    b. The contracted salary of the recipient;

    c. The percentage of salary to be paid,

    d. The actual cost, subtracting grants and stipends, to the institution,

    e. The length of time the recipient is to be on leave;

    f. The method of replacing the person and the cost to the institution, if any.

16. It is anticipated that special circumstances may arise which are not addressed in the Guidelines. Any institution may submit special requests to the Council on Higher Education for review and recommendation.

17. Any guidelines adopted by the Council on Higher Education, in conjunction with the institutions, shall be reviewed annually.

Council on Higher Education
April 1, 1971

SABBATICAL STUDY

I. Purpose: To examine the value and purpose of specific professional leave programs as a follow up to the general guidelines developed on professional leave by the Council on Higher Education.

II. Need for professional leave.

A. Identify differing roles of universities, state colleges and community colleges in need for leave program.

B. Statement of goals and objectives of professional leave.
1. Allow professional growth of faculty member.
2. New concepts and methods of teaching accrue to the institution upon return from leave.

III. Benefit analysis of professional leave programs.

A. Critique of specific projects--new knowledge, new methods and techniques of instruction.

B. Research and publications.

C. Benefits through personal contacts with academic colleagues.
1. Attracting faculty from other institutions.
2. Additional grants and contacts.
3. Attraction of international and national lecturers.
4. Placement of undergraduate and graduate students in advanced degree programs.
5. Enhancing the academic reputation of the institution.

IV. General statistical evaluation of the professional leave program.

A. Funding: Data will be collected to determine full cost of leave; i.e., salary paid by institution, personal funds, grants and awards.

B. Replacement of faculty:
1. Employment of additional faculty; rank, salary, special characteristics of replacement faculty.
2. Internal adjustment of course load by other colleagues.

C. Attrition of professional leave faculty members over a five-year period.

D. Student evaluation of professional leave faculty as compared to non-professional leave persons.

E. Number of faculty who are eligible for leave as compared to those who apply or are actually granted leave.

F. Teaching load comparison upon return.

G. Number and types of research publications produced by professional leave faculty as compared to other faculty.

H. Rank, faculty awards, positions held of leave recipients as compared to other faculty.

V. Procedure.

A. Questionnaire will be distributed to all leave recipients for the past two years (400).

B. A random sample of professional leave recipients will be selected along with a matched sample of non-leave faculty members for a comparison study.

C. An in-depth interview will be conducted with a small selected sample to verify questionnaire and provide individual case data.